

REMARKS

This Response addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed August 30, 2006. Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this case and for indicating that the previous §112 rejections have been withdrawn. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants believe that all outstanding issues have been addressed and that each and every remaining claim (Claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 10) are in condition for final allowance. Prompt notice to such effect is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,331,984 to Luciani ("Luciani") and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,434,627 to Millet et al. ("Millet").

A. The Present Invention

As claimed, the present invention combines: (1) a translator for translating a destination address of a packet from a mobile terminal (address of a communication destination terminal of the mobile terminal); (2) a translation server which acquires translation information from said translator and registers the acquired translation information therein; and (3) another translator at a location of the mobile terminal *after movement of the mobile terminal* which acquires said translation information from said translation server after the mobile terminal is moved. With these features, the present invention provides the advantage that the mobile terminal need not make an address query after the mobile terminal is moved.

The amendments to the independent claims overcome each of the Examiner's bases for the 103 rejections. In the Examiner's comments, it is suggested that: (1) Luciani discloses in FIG. 1 that routers (i.e., translators) 130 and 140 are located between domains A and D; (2) Luciani discloses that the domains A and D perform routing of communications intra-domain or with another domain; (3) Millet discloses a mobile terminal; and (4) Millet discloses the holding of translation information for a home address and a global address. The Examiner then rejects all of the claims as being obvious in light of the combination of Luciani and Millet.

However, the presently claimed invention's translation information differs from those disclosed in Luciani and Millet in its content. The translation information included in the translators and a translation server defined in Claim 1 represents a variety of different translation information. Specifically, this translation information includes a destination address (i.e., an address of a communications destination terminal) of a packet which a mobile terminal transmits. Also, this translation information includes an address of a communication destination terminal in a protocol used in a network to which the mobile terminal belongs. Finally, this translation information includes an address of a communications destination terminal in a protocol used in a network to which the communication destination terminal belongs. Neither Luciani nor Millet disclose such translation information, and neither of these references disclose a translator and a translation server that holds this type of translation information (as claimed).

B. The Cited Prior Art In Detail

In more detail, in Luciani, translation information held in a translator is not translation information representing an address of a communications destination terminal. Instead, Luciani's translation information includes an address of a terminal under the control of the translator itself. At col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 34, Luciani discloses a specific procedure for address translation. Particularly as disclosed at col. 3, lines 29-32, the translator does not translate an address of a terminal which belongs to another network (as claimed). Instead, this portion of Luciani states that the translator translates only an address of a terminal under the control of the translator itself. For example, the switch (router) 130 translates an address of host 111 or host 112, and switch 150 translates an address of host 121 or 122. Conversely, there is disclosed in col. 3, lines 2-6 and lines 20-21 that a globally unique address of a communications destination terminal which belongs to another network must be pre-specified by a source terminal. This is vastly different than the claimed invention.

In the present invention, even when the communication destination terminal belongs to another network, a source terminal may specify an address of the communication destination terminal by a protocol used in a network to which the source terminal belongs. This is true because the translator translates the address of the communication destination terminal (i.e., the destination address) into a protocol used in the network to which the communication destination terminal belongs.

The translation information in Millet serves to translate a home address and a global address of a mobile terminal. The translation information, as set forth at col. 4, lines 15-18, translates a source address when sending data from the mobile terminal (i.e., a mobile terminal address) or a destination address when sending receiving data from the mobile terminal (i.e., mobile terminal address as well). In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the translation information is for the purpose of translating a destination address when the mobile terminal transmits a packet (i.e., a communication destination terminal address).


As set forth above, Applicants' defined "translation information of an address of communication destination terminal when the mobile terminal sends a packet" is not taught or suggested in either Luciani or Millet. Therefore, the features of the present invention that a translator for performing address translation according to the translation information (correspondence) and a translation server which receives the translation information from a source translator of the mobile terminal and sends translation information to a translator at a location of the mobile terminal after the terminal has moved is not taught or suggested by these references.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that all claims of the present invention are now in condition for final allowance. If the Examiner feels that any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at the contact information below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration No. 34,072

Robert D. Kucler
Registration No. 45,908

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200
February 28, 2007
SPF/JCM/RK